

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Allowed and allowable claims

Applicant appreciates that the Examiner has indicated claims 25 and 82-91 would be allowable if they are rewritten to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103(a)

Claims 24, 92-99, and 102-108 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Schloss* (U.S. Patent 6,220,101). Claims 100 and 101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schloss*. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Schloss* does not teach or suggest at least the limitation of a flexible electrical connection that is provided between the at least one sensor and the control device (see Claim 24).

In the Office Action, the Examiner considered the electrically conducting shunts (114) as flexible on the ground that they are thin metal wires. Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Schloss* teaches an apparatus for measuring the pressure at multiple points using several pressure sensors. Each sensor is mounted unmovably and rigid in a recess of the base (see Fig. 3). Each pressure sensor itself includes a cap portion which is mounted on the base portion (column 2, line

35 to 36). Therefore, *Schloss* teaches that the pressure sensor is rigidly fixed to the base. Furthermore, the connection between the pressure sensor and the circuit board is made by a pair of electrically conducting shunts (114) that extend through the base portion. In contrast to the Examiner's opinion there is no disclosure in *Schloss* that the conducting shunts establish a flexible electrical connection between the sensor and the circuit board. In fact, it is not necessary because the sensor is held rigidly in the recess.

Applicant wishes to emphasize that there is no disclosure in *Schloss* that the conducting shunts (114) are thin metal wires. According to the MPEP, arguments based on measurement of drawing features are of little value if the reference does not disclose that the drawings are to scale and is silent as to dimensions (see MPEP §2125). The Examiner read the conducting shunts (114) of *Schloss* as thin metal wires. This reading is based on the measurement of the dimension of the conducting shunts (114) and, according to the MPEP, is of little value because *Schloss* does not disclose that its drawings are to scale and is silent as to the dimensions.

Accordingly, *Schloss* does not does not teach or suggest at least the limitation of a flexible electrical connection that is provided between the at least one sensor and the control device. Thus, claims 24 and 92-108 are patentable over *Schloss*.

In light of the foregoing remarks, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance, and early passage of this case to issue is respectfully

Application No. 09/780,274
Reply dated October 21, 2003
Response to Office Action dated July 21, 2003

requested. If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (CAM #: 037068.49745US).

October 21, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Song Zhu, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 44,420
Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 26,160

CROWELL & MORING, LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:SZ:tlm (037068.49745US)